

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed June 9, 2006, submitted concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

By this Amendment, claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-24 have been amended to put the claims in better form and to more particularly define the present invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the original claims. Thus, claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-24 are pending in this application.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended claims 8 and 9 to more particularly place in context the claim limitation “*wherein the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) are in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*”. More specifically, the claim limitation should not be interpreted to require the curing components to be in equilibrium when mixed with the main part. Instead, the claim limitation should be interpreted that only the curing component (i.e. “*the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D)*”) are in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship. To clarify the claims in this regard, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the curable resin composition of the present invention is a two-part composition. Thus, in view of such amendments, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended claim 12 which, Applicant believes, overcomes this rejection. More specifically, Applicant has claimed that the “*main part*” is a counterpart to the term “*curing agent*”. In other words, the “*main part*” is a component to be

cured by the “*curing agent*”. In addition, the claims have been amended to clarify that the claimed curable resin composition is a two-part composition. Thus, in view of such amendments, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claims 8, 11, 17, 19, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over newly cited McFadden (U.S. Patent 4,353,819). Further, claims 8, 9, 11, 14 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over newly cited Charves et al. (U.S. Patent 4,101,497) in view of McFadden. Still further, claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over previously cited Okuhira et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,333) in view of McFadden. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention under U.S. practice, the prior art reference must literally or inherently teach each and every limitation of the claims. Further, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references must either alone or in combination teach or suggest the invention as a whole, including all the limitations of the claims. Here, in this case, Applicant believes that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the limitation “*wherein the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) are in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*” of the claims.

The newly presented rejections all cite the reference McFadden since it is the only reference addressing the “*equilibrium*” limitation. Hence, Applicant believes that the present rejections will be withdrawn if it is shown that the “*equilibrium*” in McFadden is different from the “*equilibrium or the like*” of the present invention.

In McFadden, if the composition is made to be two package (i.e. two-part composition), one package comprises the acidified aminoethylated polymer, while the other package comprises the polyepoxide and ketone (see column 5, lines 17 to 25, of McFadden). Then, when both packages are blended, the acidified aminoethylated polymer and polyepoxide are reacted and the remaining acidified aminoethylated polymer together with ketone are brought to be in “*equilibrium*” with the ketimine and water (see column 5, lines 26 to 54, of McFadden). Thus, the present invention is clearly distinct from McFadden since it is the curing component in the present invention which is in “*equilibrium or the like*”.

Moreover, in the present invention, the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and water (D) are in “*equilibrium or the like*” in the curing component prior to mixing with the main part, so that when the main part and the curing component are mixed, equilibrium shifts so that the amino group-containing compound (A) consumed is compensated by such shifting in the equilibrium. As a result, the amino group-containing compound (A) is constantly and stably supplied within the curing component (see page 41, lines 6 to 22 in the specification of the present application). Hence, the main-part of the claimed composition is prevented from rapid curing, yielding a relatively long working life.

In contrast, in McFadden, when the two packages are blended, the acidified aminoethylated polymer and polyepoxide are rapidly reacted to increase the viscosity, resulting in a short working life. Accordingly, even if the remaining acidified aminoethylated polymer together with the ketone is brought into equilibrium with the ketimine and water, McFadden will not exhibit the superior property of a longer working life. Thus, the state of “*equilibrium*” in McFadden is completely different from the state of “*equilibrium or the like*” in the present invention since their respective effects are totally different from each other.

Thus, for these reasons, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: September 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Nikaido

Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant